



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

that after consultation with the rapporteurs he was prepared to withdraw it.

The President stated that M. Palacios (Spain) had desired to make a special statement on Article 39 concerning the official languages of the court.

M. Palacios (Spain) said he had hoped that the Spanish language might be authorized as an official language of the court. He did not, however, wish to raise any difficulties or to delay the discussion. He merely desired on behalf of the Spanish delegation to reserve the right to bring up the question at a more opportune moment.

The President said that there was no further amendment before the Assembly. He proposed that a vote should be taken on the whole of the resolution presented by Committee No. 3.

The Assembly thereupon adopted the resolution unanimously in the following form:

1. The Assembly unanimously declares its approval of the draft Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, as amended by the Assembly, which was prepared by the Council under Article 14 of the Covenant and submitted to the Assembly for its approval.

2. In view of the special wording of Article 14, the Statute of the court shall be submitted within the shortest possible time to the members of the League of Nations for adoption in the form of a protocol duly ratified and declaring their recognition of this Statute. It shall be the duty of the Council to submit the Statute to the members.

3. As soon as this protocol has been ratified by the majority of the members of the League, the Statute of the court shall come into force and the court shall be called upon to sit in conformity with the said Statute in all disputes between the members or States which have ratified as well as between the other States, to which the court is open under Article 35, paragraph 2, of the said Statute.

4. The said protocol shall likewise remain open for signature by the States mentioned in the Annex to the Covenant.

It was at this point that President Hymans remarked: "The resolutions are carried unanimously. Gentlemen, the whole of the draft resolutions of the committee are passed. The Statute of the International Court of Justice is now set up. I think we have accomplished a grand work."

THE LEAGUE'S ASSEMBLY MEETING AT GENEVA

From the standpoint of the League's officials and its advocates, the Assembly's first meeting, held at Geneva, registered the following important results:

1. The meeting established precedents for international discussion and co-operation going far beyond anything previously recorded in human history.

2. The League became a living reality to the delegates, many of whom had arrived in a very skeptical mood.

3. Every participating government became equipped with a staff of trained people familiar with the workings and policies of the League.

4. Delegates from the smaller nations and from countries recently counted as colonies played an unexpectedly important part in the proceedings.

5. The willingness of Japan to defer the question of race equality and the general agreement to postpone amendments to the covenant were significant proofs of unwillingness to embarrass the League.

6. The Assembly proved itself an independent body, capable of initiative and determined to assume its full share of responsibility, without any tendency toward arrogant self-assertion.

7. The organization of the League was completed and foundations were laid for its future development and improvement.

8. The adoption of a budget placed the League on a sound financial basis.

9. The internal organization created by the secretary-general was subjected to a crucial test and found in excellent working order.

10. Six new States were admitted to membership, the admission of two former enemy States marking the most important step taken so far toward a bridging of the chasms created by the World War.

11. The election of China to the Council should speed the solution of the Shantung problem and may assist that ancient empire to assume its proper place among the great autonomous powers of the world.

12. Article X of the covenant was formally interpreted as a guaranty of protection against unprovoked foreign aggression, and not as a guaranty of the territorial limits and political conditions established by the peace treaties against changes of any kind.

13. Everything possible was done to enable the United States to join the League on its own terms.

14. The adoption of the plans for an international court of justice marks the first effective step toward the creation of an international tribunal not confined to the part of a mere mediator or arbitrator.

15. An appeal to the various governments not to increase their present expenditures for armaments during the next two years was the only formal step taken on behalf of disarmament, but the temper of the meeting was unmistakably in favor of more far-reaching action within a near future.

16. Definite provisions were made for the use of the economic blockade against possible violators of the covenant.

17. Bureaus were established to deal with economic questions and international communications.

18. The principles set forth and formally adopted by an overwhelming majority of the delegations on the mandates question will go far toward compelling the future adoption of a mandate policy in agreement with the spirit of the covenant.

19. Arrangements were made for an international conference to plan effective measures against the traffic in women and children.

20. A special committee was appointed to take charge of the fight against typhus and other epidemics in eastern Europe.

THE UNITED STATES, POLITICS, AND THE LEAGUE

Mr. Harding, speaking at a meeting of the Laymen's League of the Presbyterian Church, held in Marion, December 17, at which Mr. Bryan also was a speaker, said:

One of the great essentials of the hour is an understanding between man and his God. I don't believe men have the highest type of civilization without a religious strain. We need its discipline. I want America reconsecrated to the religious reverence that was apparent in the early days of the Republic.

I am trying to give you my conception of what government ought to be, to bring into practice in American Government the thoughts that emanate from the leading minds. Just government is the highest concept in the world. I don't think a government can be wholly just that has not in some way a contract with omnipotence. In the conception of Versailles there was no recognition of God Almighty. The best relationship of the nations of the world must be founded upon the recognition of that idea. I could not hope for a happy relationship among nations unless there was a common thought among them all, the recognition of a supreme being.

Mr. Bryan Registers His Views

On December 17, following a talk with Mr. Harding, Mr. William J. Bryan said:

I am here to give whatever assistance I can, and I do not think it proper to promulgate my views. Until it became apparent that the League of Nations could not be ratified without reservations, I spoke for ratification without reservations, although there are some things in the treaty I do not approve. One of these is Article X. But I felt that time was an important thing, and that ratification should not have been delayed by a discussion of controversial questions. I thought that with the right to withdraw within two years and the wide influence this country had, we could have gained any changes we thought necessary after we entered the League. My position in this respect remains unchanged.

I never have believed that the League should have been made a political question. I think that the overwhelming majority of American people favors an international association to promote peace. I believe that the people as a whole were very little concerned with reservations. Both sides, it seems to me, magnified the importance of these reservations.

Four-fifths of the Senate voted at one time or another for ratification with some form of reservation. They should have been brought together upon reservations to which all could agree and then ratify the treaty.

After all, the big things in the treaty stand entirely above controversy. I believe that Senator Harding is not only an honest and conscientious man, but one whose whole purpose is to do what he thinks best for the American people. If a man wants to do that, and I realize that in doing it he cannot please all, the American people will trust him and will be hopeful of accomplishment.

President Nicholas Murray Butler

On December 18 President Butler, of Columbia University, conferred with Mr. Harding, and subsequently said in an interview:

There are only two known forms of international co-operation: the political and the judicial. The judicial form of international co-operation, accompanied by stated international conferences for declaring, revising, and carrying forward the rules of international law, is the form to which the people and the Government of the United States are committed by tradition and by many formal acts.

Unfortunately the influence of President Wilson at the Peace Conference was thrown against making this form of international co-operation fundamental, and in favor of that form which is political in spirit and which may easily develop into that supergovernment which every free and independent nation justly fears and dislikes. Our task now is to get back upon the right track with the least possible delay and the least possible friction.

The high cost of living and the high cost of doing business are due primarily to the high cost of government. The high cost of government in turn is due in no small degree to the fear of another international war. To lead the way in removing this fear is for the people of the United States both an opportunity and an obligation. It can be done without involving us in any of the complexities and complications of the League of Nations, as now organized, and yet without losing the advantages of close international association and co-operation.

Senator Shields, of Tennessee, Comments

On December 20 Senator Shields, of Tennessee, after conference with the President-elect, said:

I was invited here to discuss international questions and we did so. I believe, as I have all along, that the United States should not become a member of the League as it was framed at Versailles, with or without reservation. I believe that the League creates a supergovernment or an imperialism, dominated by the five great nations chiefly instrumental in the Council, and that its fundamental principle is military force.

There is no room for an imperialism under our Constitution and form of government and the American people are opposed to it. Not only is the League an imperial government, but there is in it another want of self-government, self-determination, and the principles of democracy. I am opposed to all this, and the American people do not favor it, as has been demonstrated by the whole history of our government and confirmed by the result of the great solemn referendum which President Wilson invoked.

I would favor the creation of a great international court of justice and a codification of the laws of nations to be administered by that court. That court should have jurisdiction of all controversies of nations ordinarily known as justiciable, but no questions involving the honor, sovereignty, and independence of nations. These may be arbitrated and, in order to prevent wars, I would favor treaties providing for a conference of nations, where all, great and small, might be heard, according to their absolute equality and in pursuance of settled principles of international law. But it should be so framed that no nation would surrender its sovereignty or its right to exercise its own discretion in all matters which might arise.

The system should be such that the United States, for example, would remain free, sovereign, and independent and not be involved in the political jealousies and strifes of others regarding dynasties or territories. But we should continue ready to do the just and righteous thing whenever occasion requires and our judgment might dictate. As Senator Harding is working, I feel that there is a good chance of producing something of this kind.

Senator Reed Opposes International Judiciary

Senator James Reed, of Missouri, in an interview, December 24, said:

A judicial league is no more feasible than a political league. It is the accepted rule that no judge shall sit in any case in which he has any interest; also, that the litigants themselves should not participate in the judgment.

Take the case of the Panama Canal tolls question. If submitted to an international court, the American justice would be bound, under the accepted practice, to retire. If Great Britain raised the question of tolls, it might be that the British justice also would retire, but this would leave settlement of the question to judges representing nations which would have interests identical with Great Britain's in seeing that American vessels should not have free tolls through the canal.

Mr. Taft Confers with Mr. Harding

On December 24 former President Taft and the President-elect met at Marion, and after the conversation Mr. Taft, with the approval of Mr. Harding, sent forth the following statement:

As Mr. Taft sees the principles which Mr. Harding has in mind, they are revealed as being:

A determination to avoid the political and military obligations of the present treaty and League.

A conviction that a common ground of procedure must be found with the leading powers.

A conviction that the moral force of the leading powers must be directed toward a gradually effective limitation of armament.

A belief that a court must be established with jurisdiction over all justiciable questions.

A desire to bring about a conference of nations to negotiate and press to compromise every non-justiciable question threatening war, and to obtain an arrangement by which the United States can adjust relations with Germany without subscribing to what are called objectionable features of the treaty.

An aversion to participate in commissions provided for by the treaty which concern the affairs of Europe alone.

The application to nations of the same principles of courtesy and consideration that are employed among gentlemen.

Senator Knox's Plans

Senator P. C. Knox, of Pennsylvania, after a visit to Marion, December 30, announced that he left the President-elect with the understanding that as soon as the extra session of Congress meets, in March or April, 1921, he will call for passage of the resolution which he introduced in 1920 and which President Wilson vetoed. This resolution in substance had the following aims:

1. Terminates the state of war declared to exist by joint resolution of Congress, April 6, 1917, between the United States and Germany.
2. Provides for the retention by the United States of all German property in the possession of the United States on April 6, 1917, or subsequently seized until (a) Congress makes disposition thereof; (b) until Germany by treaty provides for the satisfaction of all American claims; (c) by treaty, grants Americans favored-nation treatment; (d) until Germany confirms all fines, seizures, etc., made by the United States of German property during the war.
3. Requests the President to negotiate a treaty of amity and commerce with Germany.
4. Repeals all war legislation by Congress.
5. Provides that, until by treaty or acts of Congress it shall be determined otherwise, the United States does not waive its right under the Treaty of Versailles, the armistice of November 11, 1918, or any extensions or modifications thereof, stipulated for its benefit as one of the principal allied and associated powers.
6. Repeals Austrian war resolution.

President Harding, so Senator Knox says, will sign this resolution.

In addition, Senator Knox will suggest that Congress pass the following amendment to his original resolution:

It is the declared policy of the United States, in order to meet fully and fairly our obligations to ourselves and to the world, that, the freedom and peace of Europe being again threatened by any power or combination of powers, the United States will regard such a situation with grave concern, as a menace to its own peace and freedom, will consult with other powers affected with a view to devising means for the removal of such menace, and will, the necessity arising in the future, co-operate with the friends of civilization for its defense.

Commenting on the plan of an international court, he said that President-elect Harding's scheme contemplated a tribunal "entirely separate from the one set up in the League."

President Schurman's Impressions

Former President Schurman, of Cornell University, after a talk with Mr. Harding, January 11, said of the League policy of the incoming Executive that it would be based on "codification of international law, the establishment of a world court for the settlement of justiciable disputes, and the creation of a world conference for the conciliation of issues of a political or non-justiciable character." President Schurman thinks that no man living has such a correct sense of the aspirations and ambitions of the American people as has Mr. Harding.

Senator King's Resolution

On January 6 Senator King, of Utah, introduced a resolution calling for elimination of the Covenant of the League of Nations from the treaty, and then for ratification of the treaty by the United States in an amended form. His ground for such a proposition, he said, was the imperative necessity that terms of peace with Germany be no longer delayed. The resolution was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee.

ARMENIA AND THE UNITED STATES

On December 15 the State Department forwarded to the President of the Council of the League, in session in Geneva, the following communication:

The President has directed me to advise you that he has designated the Hon. Henry Morgenthau as his personal representative, who is prepared to proceed as soon as practicable to carry out his proffer of good offices and personal mediation in the matter of Armenia. The President, however, is still awaiting advices from the Council of the League as to the avenues through which his proffer should be conveyed and the parties with whom his representative should get in contact, as well as assurances that he may count upon the diplomatic and moral support of the principal powers represented on the Council of the League.

Mr. Morgenthau let it be known that on this errand he would pay his own expenses. Interviewed on the 19th, Mr. Morgenthau said that the fate of Armenia depended entirely upon the moral and diplomatic support of the allied nations of Europe and on their ability to discover some practical way of dealing not only with the Turkish people and its two factions, but also with the Soviet Government. He said that the Allies, if they conclude to recognize the Soviets, could easily make immunity for Armenia a condition, and that unless they do find some means of dealing with the elements now outside the diplomatic pale, the best efforts to save Armenia would probably fail.

This statement of the commissioner-designate drew forth the following comment from Mr. Jerome Landfield, a vigilant watcher of developments in the Near East and for some time connected with the Militarist Intelligence Bureau. He wrote to the *New York Times* a letter, from which we quote:

There is no question that the position of President Wilson and Mr. Morgenthau is exceedingly difficult. Armenia, after suffering untold horrors at the hands of the Turks, has now fallen into the clutches of the Bolsheviki, and the remnants of her people are now restricted to a very small area, without the shadow of independence. The great powers failed utterly in their plans for saving Armenia and the other States of the Caucasus, and now that the patient is at death's door they wash their hands of the matter and turn the case over to President Wilson. In accepting this hopeless task, he must realize that no military force is at his disposal to save Armenia, and he must also realize that no agreement entered into with the Soviet Government would be allowed by them to interfere with their plans for advancing to the east. Therefore, when Mr. Morgenthau suggests the recognition of the Soviet Government as the price of protecting the remnant of the Armenian people, he is proposing what amounts virtually to paying blackmail to Moscow, without the slightest guarantee of attaining his end. Such a proposal is too dangerous in its potentialities of harm to Europe to be seriously considered.

On December 23 the sovietized Armenia issued a statement indicating that, under complete Russian domination, it was to take the position of repudiating any debts owed by any government of the past, and there has been nothing since that date to indicate that the Russian grip on the government is to be released voluntarily or by revolt from within. Reports from Near East relief workers and American missionaries laboring in districts formerly Turkish, but now Russian, differ as to the sort of treatment that American altruists are getting from the Bolsheviki.

By a strange irony of history, at a time when the report has no especial pertinence, the President of the United States has placed in the hands of the League a document making formal recommendations as to the boundaries of the Arme-